



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,434	04/06/2001	Alexander Tetelbaum	00-294	6085
24319	7590	09/10/2004	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 LEGAL MILPITAS, CA 95035			BOWERS, BRANDON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/827,434	TETELBAUM, ALEXANDER
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brandon W Bowers	2825

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 12-17 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 6-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 6-17 in the reply filed on 12 July 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a thorough search for group 1 would search the class/subclass of group 2 and is therefore not a burden . This is not found persuasive because while the class and subclass of group 2 may be searched in searching for group 1, all the related class/subclasses for group 2 will not be search and such a search to search all the related class/subclasses relating to both groups 1 and 2 would be a serious burden to the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nassif et al., US Patent No. 6606587.

In reference to claim 6, Nassif teaches a method of estimating wire delay based on the Elmore Model that formulates a distributed RC model (Figure 3), calculates an

approximate delay based on the distributed RC model (column 3, line 10 – column 4, line 5), calculating a capacitance value based on the calculated approximate delay (column 4, line 6 – column 6, line 57) , and using the capacitance value in the Elmore Model to estimate the wire delay (column 6, line 57 – column 7, line 62).

In reference to claim 9, Nassif teaches wherein the capacitance value is a fraction of the total wire capacitance (column 4, line 6 – column 6, line 57).

In reference to claim 10, Nassif teaches calculating a wire delay using the Elmore model without using a distributed RC model (column 1, lines 13-48)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nassif et al., US Patent No. 6606587 in view of Yang et al. US Patent No. 5,469,366.

Nassif teaches a method of estimating wire delay based on the Elmore Model that formulates a distributed RC model (Figure 3), calculates an approximate delay based on the distributed RC model (column 3, line 10 – column 4, line 5), calculating a capacitance value based on the calculated approximate delay (column 4, line 6 – column 6, line 57) , and using the capacitance value in the Elmore Model to estimate the wire delay (column 6, line 57 – column 7, line 62). Nassif does not teach

calculating a time domain response and using the time domain response to calculate the approximate delay based on the distributed RC model. Yang teaches formulating a distributed RC model, calculating a time domain response and using the time domain response to calculate the approximate delay based on the distributed RC model (column 10, line 1 – column 14, line 14 and column 30, lines 16-22). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Nassif and Yang as outlined above to create a method containing all the limitations of claims 6-8 because once node voltages have been determined, the results can be compared with threshold voltages to determine the delays of a net.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12 – 17 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon W Bowers whose telephone number is (571)272-1888. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am until 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on (571)272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BWB



MATTHEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800